



Global Training for Development USAID/E&E

Diagnostic Review of Exit Questionnaire Data (1997-2002)

Central Asia Republics
(Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)

Report Content

- Methodology – Purpose
- The Exit Questionnaire
- Summary of Findings
- US-based programs: Satisfaction Rate, Key Findings, Review Sample
- In-country programs: Satisfaction Rate, Key Findings, Review Sample
- Third-country programs: Satisfaction Rate, Key Findings, Review Sample
- Overall Summary of Satisfaction Rate
- Summary of Response Rate

Prepared by
Cecilia Otero
GTD Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator
December 12, 2002

Methodology

The evaluation of training programs is achieved through the information collected in the exit questionnaires administered to the participants at the end of the training event. The exit questionnaire used to assess participant satisfaction was developed for the Global Training for Development project in collaboration with USAID/E&E training staff. A detailed description of the exit questionnaire follows on the next page.

This report reviews regional training evaluation data for the periods of CY1997-98, CY1999, CY2000, and CY2001-02 disaggregated by location of training, US based, in-country, and third country. Six separate sections of the exit questionnaire were reviewed and compared: orientation, logistics, interpretation, content, utility of training, and overall assessment. Each section contains several questions, which were tabulated together, and the results reported represent the average percentage of all the questions in the respective section. The three questions pertaining to the usefulness, relevance, and utility of training, as well as the two questions dealing with overall assessment—all of which are included in the section of the questionnaire on content—were reviewed separately in order to assess participant satisfaction in only these areas. The table on page 14 indicates the overall ratings in participant satisfaction in each section of the questionnaire by reporting period and training location. The response rate for the six sections reviewed was tabulated also by reporting period and location and is included on page 15.

The review sample is based on the number of programs with exit questionnaires administered, as well as the number of participants who submitted exit questionnaires. Statistics for the review sample are indicated in the analysis under each venue and reporting period.

Purpose

The objective of this review is twofold:

- To provide home- and field-office staff with a comprehensive summary of the training evaluation data by reporting years and training venues. Project staff will be able to compare the data of the four periods and use it appropriately for internal quality control.
- To provide a general review of key components of the training, assess its effectiveness, highlight areas that have shown improvement, and point out aspects that require greater attention.

The Exit Questionnaire

The exit questionnaire used to assess participant satisfaction in training was developed for the Global Training for Development project in collaboration with USAID/E&E training staff. The questionnaire contains a comprehensive set of questions in key areas of training: orientation, logistics, content, and utility of training in the workplace. It is structured to provide participants with a range of choices for each question useful in assessing their degree of satisfaction with the training program. The questionnaire also addresses the results-oriented approach to training emphasized under GTD by allowing participants to assess if the program was relevant to their work, and whether they will use and apply their new skills in their organizations.

Below is an explanation of each section of the exit questionnaire:

Orientation

The questions in this section inquire whether participants received orientation prior to the beginning and at the beginning of the program, the degree of involvement they had in planning their training, and how well the orientation lectures and materials prepared them for the program. The evaluation ratings for these two different sets of questions—orientation received and satisfaction with orientation—were grouped and analyzed separately. The statistical chart presented for each venue includes the breakdown of these questions.

Logistics

These questions address participant satisfaction in areas such as transportation, timeliness of allowance payment, medical insurance, training facilities, and housing.

Interpretation

In this section, participants report whether or not an interpreter was provided, and are asked to rate the language and technical skills of the interpreter(s). Participants also have the opportunity to judge the level of difficulty encountered in the interpretation or translation of activities such as classroom lectures and discussions, reading assignments, site visits, and social events.

Program Content

This section contains three different sets of questions, which were separated for the statistical analysis. One set of questions deals with the actual content of the training program and asks participants to rate the training ability and technical expertise of the instructors, the balance between theory and practice, the instructional methods, group discussions, site visits, efforts in identifying ways to apply training, and opportunities to develop professional linkages. Another set of questions addresses the relevance, usefulness, and applicability of training in the workplace, and the third set asks participants to provide an overall assessment of the training. The statistical chart presented for each venue includes the breakdown of these questions.

Summary of Findings

The overall rates in participant satisfaction for training programs conducted in the Central Asia Republics (CAR) are consistently high across venues and reporting periods, above 90% in most areas. In 2000 and again in 2001-02, the ratings in most areas of training either improved or remained at the high levels recorded the previous year reaching 99%-100% in utility/applicability of training for US-based programs. Refer to the table on page 14 for a comparison of the overall ratings in participant satisfaction in each section of the questionnaire by reporting periods and training venues.

Below are observations and explanations for the overall findings in each area of training:

Orientation

For US-based training, the number of participants who reported having received orientation declined somewhat in 1999, but increased the two following years reaching 92% in 2001-02. The number of participants who judged being well prepared for their training increased steadily each year achieving a score of 94% in 2001-02.

For third-country training, the number who reported having received orientation is much lower than for US training with a four-year average of 81%. This decline is due to a significant increase in regional programs within CAR in the last three years and, as a norm, participants do not receive orientation when traveling within Central Asia. Although the satisfaction rate for those who received orientation decreased somewhat in 2000, it improved significantly the following year reaching 92%. Because pre-departure orientation is not a component of in-country training, this section was not included.

Logistics

Participants expressed a consistently high level of satisfaction with the various aspects of logistics in the three venues. The four-year average for in-country and third-country training is 96% and for US training 95%.

Interpretation Services

The satisfaction rates for US training are consistently high throughout the reporting periods with rates of 98%-99% in the last two years. While the rates are somewhat lower for third-country training, the overall four-year average is a strong 94.5%.

For in-country training, the satisfaction rates improved steadily in the last three years reaching 91% in 2001-02. Interpretation services for in-country training in the CAR region, however, present certain unique characteristics. There was a considerable increase in 2001-02 of participants from rural areas who usually do not have strong language skills in Russian, the language used for interpretation. In the exit questionnaire, participants are asked to rate 'the degree of technical knowledge and overall language skills [of the interpreter] in your language'. Because the interpretation is done in Russian and not in the native language of the participants, the wording of these questions does not reflect the reality of interpretation services provided in this region. Thus, these two questions were eliminated from the overall tabulation and the rating being reported is based on the questions that refer to the level of difficulty encountered in the translation of classroom lectures and discussions, reading assignments, and site visits.

Content

The satisfaction rate for the various components of program content are extremely high for US training throughout the four years and show improvement each year reaching 97% in 2001-02. While the scores on content for in-country and third-country training are somewhat lower, the overall four-year average for each of these two venues is 90%.

The strong positive responses in these areas demonstrate that quality training providers were selected to conduct training who had the expertise to respond to the demands and needs of USAID-sponsored training. These responses also indicate that the training providers specialized in the participants' professional fields and were able to relate the information being provided to the conditions and situation in their respective countries.

Utility and Applicability of Training

The relevance, utility, and applicability for US training received the highest scores of all the areas and venues, 99%-100% in the last three years. The rates for in-country and third country training were also high and improved each year with an overall average of 93.5% and 96% respectively.

The success of training is measured by the application in the workplace of the skills, knowledge, and attitudes acquired by the participants. Participants may agree that the program was useful and relevant to their work, but they need assistance and clear guidelines to focus on its applicability. The number of participants who judged 'good/very good' efforts in identifying ways to apply training was an average of 94.5% for US training, 87% for in-country training, and 90% for third-country.

Above high percentages indicate that this important component of training—efforts in identifying ways to apply training—was implemented successfully. Either through the development of concrete action plans or group discussions participants identified potential areas where they could effect change in their respective work or communities. In addition, they examined solutions to the challenges and constraints they expected to encounter in their efforts to apply their training. This activity has remained an integral component of the training programs in the three venues.

Overall Assessment

A high number of US participants (96%) and third-country participants (92%) assessed their experience as positive. While the ratings for in-country participants was somewhat lower in this section, the four-year average is 84.5%.

The following three sections of this report include a summary of satisfaction rates, a review of key findings, as well as participant and program statistics for each reporting year and venue of training, US, in-country, and third country.

Central Asia US-based Training

Statistical Summary of Satisfaction Rate

The table below presents a four-year comparison of the average ratings in participant satisfaction for the various components that comprise each training criterion. The statistics are based on calendar year.

Criteria	US based			
	1997-98	1999	2000	2001-02
Orientation				
Received ¹	89%	84%	86%	92%
Satisfaction rate ²	89%	91%	93%	94%
Logistics				
Satisfaction rate	93%	94%	96%	97%
Interpretation				
Satisfaction rate	94%	97%	99%	98%
Content				
Satisfaction rate	90%	94%	95%	97%
Utility/Applicability³				
Agreement rate	98%	99%	99%	100%
Overall Assessment⁴				
Positive	92%	98%	99%	95%
	N=198	N=129	N=55	N=30

¹ Includes 4 questions:

- Did you receive orientation prior to the beginning of your program?
- Did you receive orientation at the beginning of your program?
- Were the training objectives discussed with you?
- Were you actively involved in planning your training?

² Includes 3 questions:

- How well did the orientation prior to the training prepare you?
- How well did the orientation at the beginning of the training prepare you?
- On a scale of 1-5, how well prepared were you for this program?

³ Includes 3 questions:

- The program was useful
- The program was relevant to my work
- I will be able to apply what I learned in my work

⁴ Includes 2 questions:

- Overall, how would you assess training experience?
- Would you describe your training experience as positive?

Central Asia US-based Training

Key Findings

Overall findings

Participants expressed a high level of satisfaction in the four reporting periods in all areas of US training, above 90% in all instances. Moreover, the ratings show a steady improvement in the last three years in key areas—orientation (satisfaction), content, and utility/applicability of training—reaching 98%-99% in several instances and a perfect 100% in utility/applicability in 2001-02. Below is a review of findings for each area of training covering the four reporting periods. (Refer to the table on the previous page for a comparison of the ratings in the four reporting periods).

Findings for each area of training

Orientation - The number of participants who reported having received orientation declined somewhat in 1999, but increased significantly in the last two years reaching a high 92% in 2001-02. The satisfaction rate in orientation improved each year with an average score of 92% for the four years.

Logistics - Aspects of logistics, such as housing, transportation, timeliness of allowance payments, and the quality of training facilities also received high participant satisfaction, which improved steadily each year reaching 97% in 2001-02. The average rate for the four years is 95%.

Interpretation - Participants expressed a high level of satisfaction over the four years in all key areas of interpretation, such as the language skills/technical knowledge of the interpreters, the quality of translated materials, and classroom lectures/discussions. The satisfaction rate is consistently high throughout the reporting period reaching 99%-98% in the last two years.

Content - The number of participants who rated ‘good/very good’ key aspects of the program content, such as the training ability/technical expertise of the instructors, site visits, instructional methods, pace of instruction, and the extent to which objectives were met increased each year reaching 97% in 2001-02. The average rate for the four years is 94%.

Utility\Applicability - The relevance, utility, and applicability of training received the highest scores throughout the reporting period reaching 99%-100% in the last two years. An average of 94.5% rated ‘good/very good’ efforts in identifying ways of applying training in the workplace.

Overall Assessment - Although the number of participants who assessed their training experience as positive declined somewhat in the last year, from 99% to 95%, the average for the four years is a strong 96%.

Participant and program statistics represented in each year of the review sample are included on the following page.

Central Asia US-based Training

The Review Sample

Participants

Number of US participants trained and number represented in the review sample:

	1997-1998	1999	2000	2001-02
Number of participants who completed US training	203	130	69	39
Number of participants who submitted exit questionnaires	198	129	55	30
Percentage of participants represented in the review sample	98%	99%	80%	77%
Average Age	44	44	44	47

Training Programs

Number of US programs implemented and number represented in the review sample:

	1997-1998	1999	2000	2001-02
No. of US programs implemented	20	15	15**	8**
No. of programs with exit questionnaires administered *	17	13	13	7
No of programs represented in the review sample	17	13	12***	6***
Percentage of programs represented in the review sample	100%	100%	92%	86%

*Programs such as conferences, seminars, internships, normally, do not have exit questionnaires administered.

**Programs attended by participants from more than one country are counted once for this purpose.

***The EQs for one program were not returned by the training provider.

Central Asia In-Country Training

Summary of Satisfaction Rate

The table below presents a four-year comparison of the average ratings in participant satisfaction for the various components that comprise each training criterion. The statistics are based on calendar year. Because pre-departure orientation is not a component of in-country training, this section was not analyzed.

Criteria	In-country			
	1997-98	1999	2000	2001-02
Orientation				
Received	Not analyzed			
Satisfaction rate				
Logistics				
Satisfaction rate	95%	96%	96%	98%
Interpretation				
Satisfaction rate	92%	82%	89%	91%
Content				
Satisfaction rate	88%	92%	90%	90%
Utility/Applicability¹				
Agreement rate	89%	93%	96%	96%
Overall Assessment²				
Positive	80%	83%	89%	86%

N=2,468

N=3,641

N=2,534

N=1,998

¹ Includes 3 questions:

- The program was useful
- The program was relevant to my work
- I will be able to apply what I learned in my work

² Includes 2 questions:

- Overall, how would you assess training experience?
- Would you describe your training experience as positive?

Central Asia In-Country Training

Key Findings

Overall findings

The satisfaction rates for in-country training either improved in 2001-02 or remained at the high levels recorded the previous year in all areas of training except overall assessment. Logistics and utility/applicability of training received the highest ratings reaching 98% and 96% in 2001-02. (Refer to the table on the previous page for a comparison of the ratings in the four reporting periods).

Findings for each area of training

Orientation - Because pre-departure orientation is not a component of in-country training, this section was not analyzed.

Logistics - The various aspects of logistics received a consistently high satisfaction rate over the four years, reaching 98% in 2001-02.

Interpretation - The satisfaction rate with the various aspects of in-country interpretation improved steadily in the last three years reaching 91% in 2001-02. Refer to Summary of Findings on page 3 for an explanation of the characteristics of in-country interpretation in Central Asia.

Content - The number of participants who judged 'good/very good' key aspects of the program content remained high each year with an average of 90% for the four reporting years.

Utility/Applicability - The number of participants who agreed that the training was useful, relevant, and applicable to the workplace increased in 1999 and again in 2000 and remained at a high 96% in the fourth year. An average of 87% believed that efforts in identifying ways to apply training in the workplace were 'good/very good'.

Overall Assessment - The number of participants who assessed their training experience as positive increased in 1999 and 2000. While there was a slight decrease in the fourth year from 89% to 86%, the overall average for the four years is 84.5%.

Participant and program statistics represented in each year of the review sample are included on the following page.

Central Asia In-Country Training

The Review Sample

Participants

Number of in-country participants trained and number represented in the review sample:

	1997-1998	1999	2000	2001-02
Number of participants who completed in-country training	4,207	3,756	4,144	2,711
Number of participants who submitted exit questionnaires	2,468	3,641	2,534	1,998
Percentage of participants represented in the review sample	59%	97%	61%	74%
Average Age	40	39	39	38

Training Programs

Number of in-country programs implemented and number represented in the review sample:

	1997-1998	1999	2000	2001-02
Number of in-country programs implemented	105	85	80	59
Number of programs with exit questionnaires administered *	101	81	65	51
Number of programs represented in the review sample	75	71	65	51
Percentage of programs represented in the review sample	74%	88%	100%	100%

*Programs such as conferences, seminars, internships, normally, do not have exit questionnaires administered.

NOTE: Several packages with exit questionnaires were lost en route to Almaty; thus, the lower number of programs represented in the review sample in 1997-99.

Central Asia Third-Country Training

Summary of Satisfaction Rate

The table below presents a four-year comparison of the average ratings in participant satisfaction for the various components that comprise each training criterion. The statistics are based on calendar year.

Criteria	Third Country			
	1997-98	1999	2000	2001-02
Orientation				
Received ¹	93%	74%	78%	80%
Satisfaction rate ²	92%	89%	84%	92%
Logistics				
Satisfaction rate	96%	95%	97%	97%
Interpretation				
Satisfaction rate	96%	93%	95%	94%
Content				
Satisfaction rate	92%	91%	89%	90%
Utility/Applicability³				
Agreement rate	98%	95%	96%	96%
Overall Assessment⁴				
Positive	94%	93%	91%	91%

N=345

N=424

N=414

N=444

¹ Includes 4 questions:

- Did you receive orientation prior to the beginning of your program?
- Did you receive orientation at the beginning of your program?
- Were the training objectives discussed with you?
- Were you actively involved in planning your training?

² Includes 3 questions:

- How well did the orientation prior to the training prepare you?
- How well did the orientation at the beginning of the training prepare you?
- On a scale of 1-5, how well prepared were you for this program?

³ Includes 3 questions:

- The program was useful
- The program was relevant to my work
- I will be able to apply what I learned in my work

⁴ Includes 2 questions:

- Overall, how would you assess training experience?
- Would you describe your training experience as positive?

Central Asia Third-Country Training

Key Findings

Overall findings

Participant satisfaction in third-country training remained strong throughout the four reporting periods, above 90% in most areas. The highest ratings are in logistics and utility/applicability of training, with a four-year average of 96% in each category. Orientation showed significant improvement in 2001-02 from 84% to 92%. Below is a review of findings for each area of training covering the four reporting periods. (Refer to the table on the previous page for a comparison of the ratings in the four reporting periods).

Findings for each area of training

Orientation - Although the number of participants who reported having received orientation increased in the last two years, it did not reach the 93% recorded in 1997-98. This decline is due to an increase in regional programs as participants do not receive orientation when travelling within Central Asia. The number who believed to be well prepared for the training decreased in 2000, but improved significantly the following year to 92%. The overall average rating for the four years is 89%.

Logistics - The satisfaction rate in logistics remained high throughout the four years with an overall average of 96%.

Interpretation - Participant satisfaction with the various aspects of interpretation remained above 92% each reporting year with an overall average of 94.5%.

Content - The ratings for the various components of this section decreased slightly in the last two years, but the overall four-year average is a strong 90.5%.

Utility/Applicability - The usefulness, relevance, and applicability of training received high scores throughout the four years with an overall average of 96%. An average of 90% rated 'good\very good' efforts in identifying ways to apply training in the workplace.

Overall Assessment - Although the number of participants who judged their training experience as positive decreased somewhat in the last two years, it remained above 90% throughout the reporting period with an overall average of 92%.

Participant and program statistics represented in each year of the review sample are included on the following page.

Central Asia Third-Country Training

The Review Sample

Participants

Number of third-country participants trained and number represented in the review sample:

	1997-1998	1999	2000	2001-02
Number of participants who completed third-country training	379	471	512	520
Number of participants who submitted exit questionnaires	345	424	414	444
Percentage of participants represented in the review sample	91%	90%	81%	85%

Average Age	41	41	40	39
--------------------	----	----	----	----

Training Programs

Number of third-country programs implemented and number represented in the review sample:

	1997-1998	1999	2000	2001-02
No. of third-country programs implemented	41	56	59**	52**
No. of programs with exit questionnaires administered	41	49	56	47
No of programs represented in the review sample*	36	49	53	47
Percentage of programs represented in the review sample	88%	100%	95%	100%

*Programs such as conferences, seminars, internships, normally, do not have exit questionnaires administered.

**Programs attended by participants from more than one country are counted once for this purpose.

NOTE: The exit questionnaires for five '97-98 programs and three 2000 programs were lost; thus, the lower number of programs represented in the review sample.

Overall Summary of Satisfaction Rate CENTRAL ASIA

The table below presents a comparison of the average percentages in participant satisfaction in the six sections of the questionnaire. Because pre-departure orientation is not part of in-country training, this section was not analyzed. The number of participants who responded to the questionnaire is also indicated by venue and reporting period.

Criteria	US based				In-country				Third Country			
	1997-98	1999	2000	2001-2	1997-98	1999	2000	2001-2	1997-98	1999	2000	2001-2
Orientation												
Received	89%	84%	86%	92%	Not analyzed				93%	74%	78%	80%
Satisfaction rate	89%	91%	93%	94%					92%	89%	84%	92%
Logistics												
Satisfaction rate	93%	94%	96%	97%	95%	96%	96%	98%	96%	95%	97%	97%
Interpretation												
Satisfaction rate	94%	97%	99%	98%	92%	82%	89%	91%	96%	93%	95%	94%
Content												
Satisfaction rate	90%	94%	95%	97%	88%	92%	90%	90%	92%	91%	89%	90%
Utility/Applicability												
Agreement rate	98%	99%	99%	100%	89%	93%	96%	96%	98%	95%	96%	96%
Overall Assessment												
Positive	92%	98%	99%	95%	80%	83%	89%	86%	94%	93%	91%	91%

US-based

1997-98 N = 198
1999 N = 129
2000 N = 55
2001-02 N = 30

In-country

1997-98 N = 2,468
1999 N = 3,641
2000 N = 2,534
2001-02 N = 1,998

Third country

1997-98 N = 345
1999 N = 424
2000 N = 414
2001-02 N = 444

Summary of Response Rate Central Asia

The response rate indicated in the chart on the next page refers to the average percentage of participants who responded to the questions in each section of the questionnaire. The response rate varies considerably in the three venues from section to section and from year to year. The overall response rate for US training is high above 85% in most areas. The lower response rate for in-country training during the first two years is largely due to the fact that the technical assistance contractors, who conduct a large number of training programs, normally do not provide an explanation to the participants about the exit questionnaire. This situation was addressed during site visits when AED staff had the opportunity to clarify questions and emphasize the importance of completing the entire questionnaire. As a result, there is an increase in the response rate in 2000 and 2001-02 in most areas.

The overall response rate for third-country training is somewhat higher than for in-country, but it varies considerably from section to section, with the highest scores being in content, utility/applicability of training and overall assessment.

While there is a substantial representation of training programs in the evaluation data for all venues and years, the lower percentages for in-country training in logistics and interpretation indicate that participants do not complete the entire questionnaire. This is especially true in questions pertaining to activities that were not included in their specific training event. Instead of indicating '*not part of the program*', participants tend to leave the question unanswered, which has an impact on the overall response rate.

The chart below presents a comparison of the average response rate for each of the sections of the questionnaire by venue and reporting years.

Summary of Response Rate

	US				In-Country				Third Country			
Criteria	'97-98	1999	2000	2001\2	'97-98	1999	2000	2001-02	'97-98	1999	2000	2001-02
Orientation												
Received	77%	97%	97%	99%	not analyzed				25%	37%	89%	84%
Satisfaction	80%	92%	96%	94%					35%	33%	81%	78%
Logistics												
Satisfaction	85%	94%	95%	97%	44%	36%	51%	68%	76%	62%	87%	89%
Interpretation												
Satisfaction	75%	90%	85%	93%	31%	33%	33%	20%	42%	52%	56%	67%
Content												
Satisfaction	90%	91%	96%	93%	72%	73%	75%	86%	83%	79%	86%	87%
Utility of training												
Satisfaction	87%	93%	97%	98%	77%	86%	91%	98%	90%	96%	97%	98%
Overall assessment												
Satisfaction	80%	96%	97%	97%	53%	64%	82%	80%	63%	71%	93%	88%